Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/584,904	SAUERMANN, VOLKER	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Michael Chao	2442	
All Participants:	Status of Application:		
(1) <u>Michael Chao</u> .	(3) <u>Robert L. Hails</u> .		
(2)	(4)		
Date of Interview: 23 June 2009	Time: <u>4 P.M. EST</u>		
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative) Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:			
Part I.			
Rejection(s) discussed:			
Claims discussed: Draft amended claim 1 (see attachment)			
Prior art documents discussed:			
Leinberger, Walser (US 6,031,984)			
Part II.			
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: See Continuation Sheet			
Part III.			
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above. 			
(A ₂	pplicant/Applicant's Representati	ive Signature – if	appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: As prior discussed, applicant responded with a further set of draft claims on 6/17/2009, herein attached. Robert Hails described the embodiment represented in draft claim 1 (6/17/2009), and held the position that the draft claim distinguished over Leinberger and Walser. Examiner maintained that the draft claim 1 would be considered obvious in reference to Leinberger in view of Walser. No agreement was reached.